

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 6 has been amended. Claims 6-11 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBry (US 6,385,728) (hereinafter "DeBry") in view of Berkema et al. (US 2003/0002072) (hereinafter "Berkema") and further in view of Stodder et al. (US 5,727,890) (hereinafter "Stodder").

Claims 6-11

Amended claim 6 recites: "...transmitting the security information and the document data directly to the receiving facsimile machine from the transmitting facsimile machine... wherein the security information is directly transmitted via a security communication line different from a communication line that directly transmits the document data from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine." Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraph [0031] of the specification.

As noted in the Office Action, the primary reference DeBry does not discuss the technical feature recited in claim 6 of different security and communication lines. Specifically, in DeBry, all of the communications, including the encrypted will call certificate, appear to be through the same line. Instead, the Office Action relies on Berkema to show the feature of claim 6 where the security information is directly transmitted via a security communication line different from a communication line that directly transmits the document data from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine. In particular, the Office Action relies on paragraph [0053] of Berkema.

Paragraph [0053] of Berkema discusses providing direct communication between a PDA 402 and a print content location 414. The PDA 402 establishes a wireless link 404 with the print device 406, and preferably of the print device 406 acknowledging the PDA 402 over the link 404. Further steps include the PDA establishing a communications link 412 with the location 414 having the desired print content. See Berkema, paragraph [0053] and Figure 4.

In contrast to claim 6, the "separate lines" in Berkema are the PDA 402 establishing a wireless link 404 with the print device 406, and the print device 406 acknowledging the PDA 402 over the link 404.

To clarify the difference between claim 6 and the relied upon references, claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the security information and the document data are **directly** transmitted to the receiving facsimile machine from the transmitting facsimile machine and the security information is **directly** transmitted via a security communication line different from a communication line that **directly** transmits the document data from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine.

By contrast, Berkema does not teach establishing separate communication and security links between the PDA 402 and the print device 406 and therefore it is respectfully submitted that Berkema does not obviate the technical feature of claim 6 where the security information is **directly** transmitted via a security communication line different from a communication line that transmits the document data from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine.

This technical feature of claim 6 allows for authorized users to be authenticated to print predetermined document data even when transmitting and receiving facsimile machines do not share the same manufacturer or the same protocol, which is a technical advantage not realized by the relied upon prior art. In particular, it is respectfully noted that the print by reference communication method disclosed in Berkema could not realize the technical advantages provided by claim 6.

Claims 7-11 depend on claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 6, 2009

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501